

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
Senator In Congress				
Elizabeth A. Warren - Democratic	632	678	600	1910
Geoff Diehl - Republican	1075	1082	948	3105
Shiva Ayyadurai - Independent	43	32	49	124
Write-Ins Scattered	0	2	0	2
Blanks	22	30	11	63
Governor & Lieutenant Governor				
Baker and Polito - Republican	1385	1367	1198	3950
Gonzalez and Palfrey - Democratic	311	364	329	1004
Write-Ins Scattered	5	6	5	16
Blanks	71	87	76	234
Attorney General				
Maura Healey- Democratic	942	966	848	2756
James R. McMahon, III- Republican	782	798	708	2288
Write-Ins Scattered	0	2	0	2
Blanks	48	58	52	158
Secretary of State				
William Francis Galvin - Democratic	1048	1090	933	3071
Anthony M. Amore- Republican	631	622	568	1821
Juan G. Sanchez, Jr. - Green Rainbow	31	36	37	104
Write-Ins Scattered	0	3	0	3
Blanks	62	73	70	205
Treasurer				
Deborah B. Goldberg - Democratic	895	920	805	2620
Keiko M. Orrall- Republican	754	761	672	2187
Jamie M. Guerin - Green Rainbow	30	38	34	102
Write-Ins Scattered	0	1	0	1
Blanks	93	104	97	294
Auditor				
Suzanne M. Bump - Democratic	827	833	770	2430
Helen Brady - Republican	789	804	679	2272
Daniel Fishman-Libertarian	54	67	47	168
Edward J. Stamas- Green-Rainbow	19	17	24	60
Write-Ins Scattered	0	1	0	1
Blanks	83	102	88	273
Representative in Congress 9th District				
Bill Keating - Democratic	833	870	768	2471
Peter D. Tedeschi- Republican	873	883	781	2537
Write-Ins Scattered	1	1	0	2
Blanks	65	70	59	194

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
Councillor 4th District				
Christopher A. Iannella, Jr.- Democratic	1197	1254	1097	3548
Write-Ins Scattered	5	8	5	18
Blanks	570	562	506	1638
Senator in General Court 2nd Plymouth & Bristol District				
Michael D. Brady - Democratic	891	951	814	2656
Scott Hall - Republican	781	758	692	2231
Write-Ins Scattered	0	1	0	1
Blanks	100	114	102	316
Representative in General Court 6th Plymouth District				
Josh S. Cutler - Democratic	1304	1344	1175	3823
Write-Ins Scattered	7	15	27	49
Blanks	461	465	406	1332
District Attorney Plymouth District				
Timothy J. Cruz - Republican	1150	1175	1007	3332
John E. Bradley, Jr.- Democratic	546	574	536	1656
Write-Ins Scattered	0	2	0	2
Blanks	76	73	65	214
Clerk of Courts Plymouth District				
Robert S. Creedon, Jr.- Democratic	1230	1275	1115	3620
Write-Ins Scattered	6	12	6	24
Blanks	536	537	487	1560
Register of Deeds Plymouth County				
John R. Buckley, Jr. - Democratic	1217	1279	1117	3613
Write-Ins Scattered	3	9	1	13
Blanks	552	536	490	1578
County Commissioner Plymouth County				
Sandra M. Wright - Republican	1285	1332	1166	3783
Write-Ins Scattered	9	12	11	32
Blanks	478	480	431	1389

QUESTION 1: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 2, 2018?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would limit how many patients could be assigned to each registered nurse in Massachusetts hospitals and certain other health care facilities. The maximum number of patients per registered nurse would vary by type of unit and level of care, as follows:

- In units with step-down/intermediate care patients: 3 patients per nurse;
- In units with post-anesthesia care or operating room patients: 1 patient under anesthesia per nurse; 2 patients post-anesthesia per nurse;
- In the emergency services department: 1 critical or intensive care patient per nurse (or 2 if the nurse has assessed each patient's condition as stable); 2 urgent non-stable patients per nurse; 3 urgent stable patients per nurse; or 5 non-urgent stable patients per nurse;
- In units with maternity patients: (a) active labor patients: 1 patient per nurse; (b) during birth and for up to two hours immediately postpartum: 1 mother per nurse and 1 baby per nurse; (c) when the condition of the mother and baby are determined to be stable: 1 mother and her baby or babies per nurse; (d) postpartum: 6 patients per nurse; (e) intermediate care or continuing care babies: 2 babies per nurse; (f) well-babies: 6 babies per nurse;
- In units with pediatric, medical, surgical, telemetry, or observational/outpatient treatment patients, or any other unit: 4 patients per nurse; and
- In units with psychiatric or rehabilitation patients: 5 patients per nurse.

The proposed law would require a covered facility to comply with the patient assignment limits without reducing its level of nursing, service, maintenance, clerical, professional, and other staff.

The proposed law would also require every covered facility to develop a written patient acuity tool for each unit to evaluate the condition of each patient. This tool would be used by nurses in deciding whether patient limits should be lower than the limits of the proposed law at any given time.

The proposed law would not override any contract in effect on January 1, 2019 that set higher patient limits.

The proposed law's limits would take effect after any such contract expired.

The state Health Policy Commission would be required to promulgate regulations to implement the proposed law. The Commission could conduct inspections to ensure compliance with the law. Any facility receiving written notice from the Commission of a complaint or a violation would be required to submit a written compliance plan to the Commission. The Commission could report violations to the state Attorney General, who could file suit to obtain a civil penalty of up to \$25,000 per violation as well as up to \$25,000 for each day a violation continued after the Commission notified the covered facility of the violation. The Health Policy Commission would be required to establish a toll-free telephone number for complaints and a website where complaints, compliance plans, and violations would appear.

The proposed law would prohibit discipline or retaliation against any employee for complying with the patient assignment limits of the law. The proposed law would require every covered facility to post within each unit, patient room, and waiting area a notice explaining the patient limits and how to report violations. Each day of a facility's non-compliance with the posting requirement would be punishable by a civil penalty between \$250 and \$2,500.

The proposed law's requirements would be suspended during a state or nationally declared public health emergency.

The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect.

The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2019.

A **YES VOTE** would limit the number of patients that could be assigned to one registered nurse in hospitals and certain other health care facilities.

A **NO VOTE** would make no change in current laws relative to patient-to-nurse limits.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
YES	480	507	411	1398
NO	1266	1289	1166	3721
BLANKS	26	28	31	85

QUESTION 2: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of Representatives before May 2, 2018?

SUMMARY

This proposed law would create a citizens commission to consider and recommend potential amendments to the United States Constitution to establish that corporations do not have the same Constitutional rights as human beings and that campaign contributions and expenditures may be regulated.

Any resident of Massachusetts who is a United States citizen would be able to apply for appointment to the 15-member commission, and members would serve without compensation. The Governor, the Secretary of the Commonwealth, the state Attorney General, the Speaker of the state House of Representatives, and the President of the state Senate would each appoint three members of the commission and, in making these appointments, would seek to ensure that the commission reflects a range of geographic, political, and demographic backgrounds.

The commission would be required to research and take testimony, and then issue a report regarding (1) the impact of political spending in Massachusetts; (2) any limitations on the state's ability to regulate corporations and other entities in light of Supreme Court decisions that allow corporations to assert certain constitutional rights; (3) recommendations for constitutional amendments; (4) an analysis of constitutional amendments introduced to Congress; and (5) recommendations for advancing proposed amendments to the United States Constitution.

The commission would be subject to the state Open Meeting Law and Public Records Law. The commission's first report would be due December 31, 2019, and the Secretary of the Commonwealth would be required to deliver the commission's report to the state Legislature, the United States Congress, and the President of the United States.

The proposed law states that, if any of its parts were declared invalid, the other parts would stay in effect. The proposed law would take effect on January 1, 2019.

A **YES VOTE** would create a citizens commission to advance an amendment to the United States Constitution to limit the influence of money in elections and establish that corporations do not have the same rights as human beings.

A **NO VOTE** would not create this commission.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
YES	1076	1126	972	3174
NO	615	622	575	1812
BLANKS	81	76	61	218

QUESTION 3: LAW PROPOSED BY INITIATIVE PETITION

Do you approve of a law summarized below, on which no vote was taken by the Senate or the House of House of Representatives before July 7, 2016?

SUMMARY

This law adds gender identity to the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination in places of public accommodation, resort, or amusement. Such grounds also include race, color, religious creed, national origin, sex, disability, and ancestry. A “place of public accommodation, resort or amusement” is defined in existing law as any place that is open to and accepts or solicits the patronage of the general public, such as hotels, stores, restaurants, theaters, sports facilities, and hospitals. “Gender identity” is defined as a person’s sincerely held gender-related identity, appearance, or behavior, whether or not it is different from that traditionally associated with the person’s physiology or assigned sex at birth.

This law prohibits discrimination based on gender identity in a person’s admission to or treatment in any place of public accommodation. The law requires any such place that has separate areas for males and females (such as restrooms) to allow access to and full use of those areas consistent with a person’s gender identity. The law also prohibits the owner or manager of a place of public accommodation from using advertising or signage that discriminates on the basis of gender identity.

This law directs the state Commission Against Discrimination to adopt rules or policies and make recommendations to carry out this law. The law also directs the state Attorney General to issue regulations or guidance on referring for legal action any person who asserts gender identity for an improper purpose. The provisions of this law governing access to places of public accommodation are effective as of October 1, 2016. The remaining provisions are effective as of July 8, 2016.

A YES VOTE would keep in place the current law, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender identity in places of public accommodation.

A NO VOTE would repeal this provision of the public accommodation law.

	Precinct I	Precinct II	Precinct III	Total
YES	929	1021	854	2804
NO	798	770	718	2286
BLANKS	45	33	36	114
TOTAL BALLOTS CAST	1772	1824	1608	5204

A true copy of the vote, Attest:

Elizabeth Sloan, CMC CMMC
Town Clerk